

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

RICKY JONES,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 10-C-560

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
BRIDGE STRUCTURAL ORNAMENTAL
AND REINFORCING IRON WORKERS et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

The plaintiff, Ricky Jones, filed a motion for continuance of the scheduling conference and an “objection to my non-participation in talks.” (Docket #155). Defendants International Association of Bridge, Structural, Ornamental, and Reinforcing Ironworkers, AFL-CIO, Ironworkers District Council of North Central States, Ironworkers Local #8, including its officers and Executive Board, Ironworkers Local 8 Health and Welfare Fund Board of Trustees, and J.P. Cullen Company filed their Rule 26(f) report. In their report, the defendants indicated that the plaintiff declined to participate in the process of compiling a joint Rule 26(f) report. The defendants further indicated that the plaintiff was offered the opportunity to confer either by telephone or by making written contributions to the report. Despite the defendants’ assertion to the contrary, the plaintiff indicates that he was not allowed the opportunity to confer in the Rule 26(f) report.

Notwithstanding the plaintiff's assertion that he was not allowed to confer in the Rule 26(f) report, his motion for a continuance of the scheduling conference will be denied. The plaintiff's motion is confusing and the court is unclear as to what the plaintiff hopes to accomplish with a continuance of the scheduling conference. The plaintiff also asks that the court order Local 8 to strictly follow reinstatement procedures. The court can not order Local 8 to follow reinstatement procedures based on the plaintiff's motion for a continuance.

In addition to his motion for a continuance, the plaintiff filed a purported affidavit addressed to Chief Judge Charles N. Clevert, Jr. He indicates that he makes the affidavit in support of resolution of the case. However, it is unclear from the plaintiff's submissions exactly what he is attempting to accomplish by filing the affidavit. He does not ask for anything by way of his submission.

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the plaintiff's motion for a continuance of the scheduling conference be and hereby is **denied**. (Docket #155). The telephone scheduling conference will take place as scheduled on Thursday May 17, 2012, at 3:00 p.m. The court will initiate the call.

Dated at Milwaukee, Wisconsin this 15th day of May, 2012.

BY THE COURT:

s/Patricia J. Gorence
PATRICIA J. GORENCE
United States Magistrate Judge